DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 856 SP 028 893

AUTHOR Dalton, Stephanie; And Others
TITLE Pre-Service Education for Teachers of Minorities: The Hawaii University/Schools Partnership Program.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Cultural Awareness; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Minority Group Children; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS *University of Hawaii

ABSTRACT

The Pre-Service Teacher Education for Teachers of Minorities (PETOM) Program is a cooperative endeavor of the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate, the University of Hawaii Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences, and the Hawaii State Department of Education. The program's principal goals are to prepare teachers for the education of cultural minorities who have liberal educations and transdisciplinary knowledge bases; who are able to reflect on and inquire into teaching practice; who will work collegially with other education professionals; and who have competency in adjusting classrooms to students' preferred patterns of social organization, speaking, thinking, and motivation. Program curriculum includes courses on teaching methods, behavior management, language development, cultural influences on cognition and education, and child development. Because PETOM field experiences are well-integrated with the academic experiences of the students, they regularly apply their academic learning to real life situations in classrooms serving at-risk minority students. Evaluation of the program suggests the difficulty in, but essential need for, coordinating the academic and field experience components to produce effective teachers. Further work is needed to coordinate administrative, organization, and faculty efforts. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED282856

Pre-Service Education for Teachers of Minorities

The Hawaii University/Schools Partnership Program

Stephanie Dalton, Roland Tharp, & Daniel Blaine

A paper delivered at the Annual Meetings of the
American Educational Research Association
Washington, D. C.
April 1987

SP028893

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. G. Tharp
S. Dalton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Pre-Service Education for Teachers of Minorities: The Hawaii University/Schools Partnership Program

by

Stephanie Dalton, Roland Tharp, & Daniel Blaine

"Minority" cultures are rapidly expanding as proportions of the American population, and of the nation's schools. For example, in the schools of the State of Hawaii, "minority" students comprise the majority of the student population. Those who are Pacific Basin peoples--Native Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian, Samoan, Tongan, or Fijian, Filipino or from recently immigrated groups do not achieve in school at a level equal to their native abilities. To prepare elementary teachers for these educationally at-risk students is the goal of the experimental pre-service teacher education program to be reported in this paper.

Many standard teaching practices, successful when applied to the majority culture student, are not effective with the educationally at-risk minority culture student. Even in Hawaii, students who do not enter school with the patterns of language and behavior typical of the U.S. mainland majority culture require special consideration if they are to succeed in school. Unfortunately, schools with heavy enrollments of underachieving minorities cannot retain their teachers, who typically transfer to middle-class schools as quickly as their seniority will permit. This is no doubt due to teachers frustration with the lack of success in their classrooms, and the frequent misunderstandings and irritations that are all too frequent at any cultural interface. Most fundamentally, it is due to teachers' genuine incompetence to teach such children--a lack of competence that is

attributable to a failure of teacher education programs to prepare them adequately for placement in schools that require special solutions.

The effective teacher of the at-risk minority student recognizes disparities of language, thinking , behaving and motivation, and promotes student achievement by making instruction compatible with certain elements of the students' natal culture. The effective teacher of underachieving minorities modifies classroom instruction to take advantage of those students' preferred patterns of

1) social organization,

2) speaking,

3) thinking, and

4) motivation.

Such modifications have been studied intensely for two decades by the Kamehameha Elementary Education Program (KEEP). Evaluation data and external evaluation teams have found the KEEP program to be of great value to the improved literacy of Hawaiian children (Tharp, 1982; Calfee, et.al., 1981). Over 75% of KEEP's classrooms are multicultural, with representatives of many cultural minorities in each. More recently, the KEEP principles of cultural adaptation of teaching methods have been applied to Navajo classrooms (Tharp, 1985; Jordan, Tharp, & Vogt, 1985), and to Hispanic classrooms (Hyland & Gallimore, 1986). The success of KEEP programs rests on intense, specific, and expensive inservice reeducation of teachers. A pre-service program was obviously needed.

Program Goals and Values

For students in this program, we have attempted to recruit intending teachers who will stick the long course of a career in the education of needful minorities, whether from motives of idealism or their own cultural identities. Their ethnicities have included Hawaiian, Filipino, American Indian, Chinese, Japanese, and Caucasian. And we have attempted to build a program that will prepare them with the basic skills needed for insuring student success, and the basic skills needed to assure their own success in solving emerging classroom problems.

Titled Pre-service Teacher Education for Teachers of Minorities, or PETOM, the principal goals of this joint program are to prepare teachers who

(1) have liberal educations;

(2) have a transdisciplinary knowledge base to apply to teaching;

(3) are able to reflect on and inquire into teaching practice;

(4) will work colleagially with other education professionals.

(5) are competent to adjust their classrooms to students' preferred patterns of a) social organization, b) speaking, c) thinking, and d) motivation.

Program Development and Formative Evaluation

The program is a cooperative endeavor of the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate, the University of Hawaii Colleges of Education and Arts & Sciences, and the State of Hawaii's Department of Education. This

Hawaii Partnership is a part of the National Network for Educational Renewal, or the "Goodlad Consortium." The unique partnership of this program means that the pre-service expertise of the University of Hawaii's College of Education combines with the Kamehameha Elementary Education Program's expertise in program development, in-service teacher training, and research base in education for minority students.

The program was planned for two years before its initial operation, and involved intense negotiation among policy makers and administrators in the cooperating institutions. An early decision--since proven to be wise--was made to go slowly, be content to be small, evaluate carefully, and constrain enrollment until the major features of the complex program were reliable and effective.

In fall of 1984, PETOM opened with a pilot cohort of 14 teachers-in-training. This group did all their observation, participation, microteaching, and student teaching in elementary classrooms of KEEP. The elementary students in those classrooms were randomly selected from applicants of Hawaiian ancestry. The program faculty consisted of a group selected for their motivation to participate, from the College of Education, KEEP program developers and researchers, and Arts & Sciences faculty. The Cooperating Teachers were volunteers from KEEP program classrooms. This first cohort's academic curriculum, however, was the standard "methods-course-" based College of Education program.

At this time it was still conceivable that this standard curriculum might be adequate, if the field experience segment of the program (and its one associated seminar) were intense enough and rich enough in minority-student issues. That supposition did not last past the first semester. Even though the graduates of that program have reported two years later that the

seminar did provide them with useful concepts and skills, the need for a more thorough going revision of the academic component was obvious. The contradictions, tensions, and lack of coordination between classroom necessities and the demands of the standard College of Education courses strained all program participants, as is indicated by the evaluation data to be reported below. Fortunately, during the two years of the first cohort, planning for the new academic portion of the current program was underway.

At the end of each year, careful semi-structured evaluation interviews were conducted with all students, faculty members, and cooperating teachers. The data from the evaluation is presented in Table 1 and 2.

The evaluation results, uniform across all groups of interviewees, have been entirely consistent with more informal sources of feedback from students and teachers, and consistent with the developing judgments of the program faculty. In Tables 1 and 2, we have retained each datum, for archival purposes, and as a means of charting the influence of the evaluation feedback on the evolution of the program design. Table 1 reports from the point-of-view of the teachers-in-training, and Table 2 reports the point-of-view of the Cooperating Teachers in Kamehameha Schools. The point-of-view of the faculty is represented by the authors of this paper. The interested reader can refer to the Tables to see the many linkages between evaluation suggestions and the right-hand column, which describes the current 1986-1988 program description. A general discussion of the major continuing themes of all rounds of the evaluations will be the conclusion of this paper.

Program development was guided by the goals and principles listed previously; by careful live observation of both student and professional

Table 1
STUDENT TEACHERS' EVALUATION DATA
1985-1986 FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAM
(n = 10)

PROGRAM	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	1986-88 PETOM PROGRAM
College of Education	Specific courses or instructors. Peer interaction across ST assignments. Methods courses in general.	ST seminar content relevance. Specific course requirements questioned. Lack of behavior management course.	Increase relevance of ST seminar content. Offer study in behavior management. Offer study in oral language development.	ACADEMIC COMPONENT: Cooperative UH/KS course work includes Classroom Management and Oral Language Development course. Course work presents instructional strategies including KEEP comprehension strategies. Methods course covers assessment, planning, social organization, evaluation, curricula, instructional strategies and resources. FIELD EXPERIENCE COMPONENT: Field experience strand includes cooperative student teaching seminar. Classroom OP activities are linked to course work. Students' OP assignments alternate between upper and lower elementary grades. OP format is experimental.
Kamehameha Schools/ Bishop Estate	KS seminar features. Integration of theory and practice. Videotaping for exemplars and self-evaluation. School staff support. Behavior management guidelines.	Communication among KS participants. OP seminar topics relevance. Specific guidelines for OP & ST lacking. Insufficient training for small group instruction. Insufficient challenge during OP classroom experience.	Increase OP classroom involvement. Include instruction in lesson and unit planning. Observe STs prior to student teaching. Provide application options in OP seminar. Offer meetings with cooperating teachers. Visit school resources with peers. Expose STs to range of grade levels.	
College of Education & Kamehameha Schools/ Bishop Estate Interface	Accreditation of third semester OP field experience (after students have received no credit for the second semester of field experience).	Seminar attendance during ST hours.	Offer early childhood emphasis. Provide instruction in KEEP comprehension strategies. Rearrange OP schedule to full day. Increase ST soloing period.	

Acronym Key
ST: Student teacher or teaching
OP: Observation and Participation: a required weekly four-hour classroom experience
KS: Kamehameha Schools
KEEP: Kamehameha Elementary Education Program
PETOM: Pre-Service Education for Teachers of Minorities

Table 2
COOPERATING TEACHERS' EVALUATION DATA
1985-1986 FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAM
(n = 10)

PROGRAM	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	1986-88 PETOM PROGRAM
College of Education	ST CC supportive; provided feedback on performance of ST. ST seminar unit and lesson planning. Methods course that covered theory and applied theory to classroom experience. Start-up workshop for STs. Meeting with other CTs.	STs lacking in lesson and unit planning skills. STs lacking behavior management skills. STs weak in math competency. Methods courses detached from classroom experience. Duration of solo ST.	Schedule ST seminar meetings outside of school hours. Apprise CTs of ST seminar content. Provide study in conflict resolution and child development. Practice opportunities for methods course work. Broadly based methods instruction. Increase communication with COE CC.	Major program goal is integration of course work and field experience. Cooperative course work includes child development and comprehensive, generic methods course. Requirements of field experience are guided by course work and teacher/instructor collaboration. Field experience includes joint UH/KS/DOE student teaching seminar. UH and KS instructors meet with program teachers and visit classrooms. UH and KS instructors and program coordinators meet weekly to problem solve and collaborate for responsible program development. DOE and UH increased remuneration for teacher participants in joint program.
Kamehameha Schools/ Bishop Estate	Cohesive ST cohort facilitated mutual support, comraderie & feedback. Value of KS teacher role models. OP experience useful preparation for ST. Variety of practice experiences. Valued administrative structure of program. Role models for collaborative problem solving.	Public school setting experiences for STs. Infrequency of ST monitoring by administrators. ST & CT meeting time. CT responsibility for training individual STs in teaching strategies.	Emphasize transitional nature of third semester OP as pre-student teaching. Strengthen order and progression of requirements for the three-semester OP. Provide duty-free meeting time. Release CTs to work as resources. Offer spot-check workshop for CTs. Encourage CTs to take the ST Supervision course. Increase integration of practice and theory.	
College of Education & Kamehameha Schools/ Bishop Estate Interface	Integration of COE course work and KS field experience to result in ideal mix.	COE & KS requirements that STs leave student teaching responsibilities for other experiences. Inequity of KS & DOE CTs' compensation.	Increase COE CC observation visitations. Improve communication between CTs and COE. ST evaluation involving meeting with CT, ST & CC present. Methods instructors visit ST classrooms.	

Acronym Key
CT: Kamehameha Schools Cooperating Teacher who has responsibility for student teachers
CC: College of Education Coordinator for student teaching
COE: College of Education
DOE: Department of Education
UH: University of Hawaii

teachers; by the evaluation interviews; by analyzing all these respondents reports; and by a careful consideration of the experiences of ourselves--the participating faculty.

Each week, during the program's four years of operation, the program faculty has met, shared experiences and opinions, and carefully considered each developing segment of the maturing program. Each semester the program design has been altered in light of emerging evaluation data and experience.

Current Program Description

The evolutionary design incorporates several innovative features. They include the addition of courses in disciplines unavailable in the traditional curriculum, made possible by compressing instruction in teaching methods. The two-semester generic methods course is focused on generic processes and principles for teaching, and highlights subject area applications in a series of mini-modules. Because the 45 credits of the traditional program are aggregated into the generic methods course, the new curriculum can accommodate important transdisciplinary coursework: the study of behavior management, language development, cultural influences on cognition and education, and theories and evidence in child development.

Because of the institutional cooperation of the PETOM partnership, the pre-service students in this program have a field experience equal to, and well-integrated with, their academic experience: they regularly apply their academic learning to real life situations in the classroom by observing and practicing their developing teaching skills in classrooms serving at-

risk minority students. Experienced KEEP teachers serve as a models and mentors for them. These cooperating teachers, as well as the course instructors, are available for guidance and assistance to the pre-service teachers as they practice their developing skills.

The partnership also means the opportunity for collaborating across institutions and roles within institutions on program operation and even on program development. Traditionally, practicing teachers have little influence on teacher education programs and no opportunity to interact with teacher education course instructors. In this program, the course instructors meet with cooperating teachers to share ideas and shape field experience coursework assignments for the pre-service teachers. A coordinator works full-time to facilitate the teachers' participation, and to represent the teachers' viewponts to the faculty.

The formal structure of the program is expressed in terms of "strands," each of which bundles sequentially arranged courses. Taken together, the strands provide the basic skills needed to build competence and confidence in teachers of educationally at-risk minority students. These strands are:

Strand One:	Basic General Teaching Methods.
Strand Two:	Theory and Research in Teaching Minority Students.
Strand Three:	Specific Teaching Skills: Classroom Management, Cognitive Development, and Language Development.
Strand Four:	Inquiry Methods in the Classroom.

The strands are sequenced as follows:

Semester	**One**	**Two**	**Three**
Strand A: **Methods**	Methods of Instruction	Methods of Instruction	Elective
Strand B: **Theory & Research**	Cognition, Culture & Education	Child Development	Theory & Research in Teaching
Strand C: **Skills**	Classroom Management	Reading, Writing, Thinking: Teaching Comprehension	Language Development
Strand D: **Inquiry**	Introduction to Inquiry	Tests & Measurement	Individual Inquiry Project

A fifth "strand" is dedicated to the **field experience** which is composed of three semesters of observation, participation and microteaching for at least four hours each week in a host classroom, serving minority at risk students, of the Kamehameha Schools or the public schools of Hawaii. The field experience culminates in student teaching during the fourth semester.

During each of the four semesters, the students are also enrolled in a continuing "field services seminar," conducted at the host school for about an hour per week, in which logistical, relationship, and communication issues are discussed.

In September 1986, the program admitted a new class of eleven graduate and undergraduate education students. At the time of this writing

(April 1987), this second cohort was in the second semester of the new integrated academic and field-training program.

Major Issues in Program Design and Operation

Based on all sources of evaluation and feedback, we have separated two major themes that are reflected in almost every facet of program evaluation. They are central and persistent enough to commend themselves as of more than local interest, and we offer them to others concerned with pre-service education of teachers.

First, the "cohort" system, in which a small group of peers marches together through all classes and schools, trials and triumphs, together, does much to create the group support, mutual assistance, program commitment and identification reported to be such a strength of this program. The small-cohort class system is in sharp contrast to the anonymity experienced by pre-service teachers in large urban homogeneous programs. The main-line program of the University of Hawaii is by no means unusual in this mass approach to professional education, and in these days of teacher shortages, the temptation will be to organize students into ever larger herds.

Second, all our participants and experiences convince us that all courses should be taught by instructors who are able and willing to devote sufficient time to coordinating with Cooperating Teachers; and with one another as members of the program.

The full potential of any program for teacher education can be achieved only if coordination between the University and field site instructors can integrate field and academic training. These issues are not

merely for bureaucratic smoothness. When academic and field training sectors are not coordinated, the understanding and problem-solving abilities of graduating teachers are fragmented. Administrative coordination results in cognitive integration for the teachers-in-training.

Therefore, we are convinced of the absolute necessity that administrative, collegial, and social coordination occur between the faculties of field site schools and the faculty of the University. This is particularly true for a program for "difficult" schools and "difficult" students--neither professors nor teachers have the full view needed to integrate scholarly knowledge and practice. "Partnerships" are more than a nice idea; they are necessary to the training of effective teachers.

We are also convinced of the difficulty of achieving that coordination. Its absence in conventional programs is not due to professorial negligence or ignorance. Neither is it due to lack of wisdom or disinterest in host schools. However, achieving good integration requires a change of mind-set by faculties of both universities and host schools, by their administrators, and by organizational structures by which decisions are taken and resources allocated.

As an example at the simplest level, coordination takes time; teachers are disinclined to absorb into a demanding professional life those increased time demands that coordination and communication require. Can release time be arranged from classrooms, so that teachers can meet with professors? Yes, if principals have this at the top of their priority list for substitute-teacher allocation. Few do. If principals agree, will teachers? Not necessarily; our own host teachers are reluctant to be away from "their" students, because their role definitions are concerned with their pupils, leaving little priority for the nurturance of the novices of their profession.

We began this program with an absolute dedication to this academic/field experience coordination; but we have been chagrined at the difficulty of achieving it. We have tried arranging various formats for written and personal collaboration among program practitioners and faculty. Faculty members attend coffee hours during the school day recess periods and, in this format, are available to meet and speak with the participating teachers and school administrators. Other social events have been planned to bring all the participants together to share experience and ideas. We have encouraged teachers to join our faculty meetings to bring their views and experience to inform our on-going discussions of program issues. This, however, requires additional time commitment which teachers are unable to invest given the current structures of their assigned duties and their mindset regarding them. The informal, personal contacts have been more successful than our written attempts but none have yet achieved the collegial linkage we ultimately hope for.

In the meantime, we have organized the coordination by dedicating a full staff position to the Coordinator role. This individual makes time, makes contact, and makes amends for student assignments in courses and classrooms.

There is much work to be done to achieve mutual acceptance of the responsibility for the regeneration of the teaching profession. Our experience of five years of intense effort has yielded one general observation that we can commend to others: unrelenting effort is required to make time for communicating. Values can be changed only through insistence, persistence, and consistency in asserting the value that everyone in the educational community has an obligation to help train teachers. We have encountered virtually no individual principal, teacher,

professor, administrator, or researcher who denies this value. We have encountered few systems that have this value incorporated into structures of administrative, organization, and faculty rewards.

REFERENCES

Calfee, R. C., Cazden, C. B., Duran, R. P., Griffin, M. P., Martus, M., & Willis, H. D. (1981). Designing reading instruction for cultural minorities: The case of the Kamehameha Education Program. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Tharp, R. G., Jordan, C., Speidel, G. E., Au, K. H., Klein, T. W., Calkins, R. P., Sloat, K. C. M., & Gallimore, R. (1984). Product and process in applied developmental research: Education and the children of a minority. In M. E. Lamb, A. L. Brown, & B. Rogoff (Eds.), Advances in developmental psychology, Vol. III. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates Inc.

Tharp, R. G. (1982). The effective instruction of comprehension: Results and descriptions of the Kamehameha Early Education Program. Reading Research Quarterly, 17, 4, 503-527.